



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,813	01/25/2001	Darryl Rubin	5486-0129PUS1	1317
67321 7590 07/17/2008 BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP PO Box 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER				
JACKSON, JAKIEDA R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/768,813

Applicant(s)

RUBIN ET AL.

Examiner

JAKIEDA R. JACKSON

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10,13-58,60-73,75-77 and 79-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10,13-58,60-73,75-77 and 79-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the Office Action mailed January 28, 2008, applicant submitted an amendment filed on April 28, 2008, in which the applicant traversed and requested reconsideration.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant argues that the specification page 13, lines 14-20 clearly teaches audio clips that are displayed in synchronism with another audio clip. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. According to the specification it clearly teaches that "the storage of the **audio** information include properties that permit the audio information to be **associated with visual**, so that one (the audio) may be displayed in synchronism with the other (the video), which is something that is well known in the art. That does not specifically imply audio clips in synchronism with audio clips and even taking the broadest interpretation, one of ordinary skill in the art would not taken the language of page 13, lines 14-20 to teach audio clips in synchronism with audio clips. Applicant also clarified that the delimited keywords are verbally dictated. The Applicant's are reminded that not using the exact language of claims was taken into consideration and the specification does not clearly teach the specific synchronizing step, as claimed.

Applicant also argues that Lucas fails to teach verbally delimited keywords. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Lucas teaches that the user defines delimiters and the input device could be voice controlled. That implies that if the user can define the delimiters and that the user can input information via a voice input, that

the keywords can be verbally delimited keywords (column 3, lines 38-44 with abstract and column 7, lines 25-30 and column 21, lines 35-67). Lucas further teaches that this information can be done by mouse, touch screen etc. (column 3, lines 38-44).

Applicant further argues that Lucas does not teach converting said verbally delimited keywords into search queries and dynamically accessing the audio clips based on the search queries. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. **Claims 1, 10, 27, 33, 43, 50, 55, 70, 73, 75, 77, 83 and 85** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, synchronizing one audio clip with another audio clip.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 27-28 and 31-35, 39-46, 48, 50-56, 58, 60, 62-63, 66-73, 75 and 77, 81-86** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit et al. (USPN 6,279,014), hereinafter referenced as Schilit in view of Mishra et al. (USPN 5,805,118), hereinafter referenced as Mishra in further view of Oliver (USPN 6,226,422) and in further view of Lucas et al. (USPN 6,012,074), hereinafter referenced as Lucas.

Regarding **claim 27**, Schilit discloses a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user comprising:

a first display portion for displaying a portion of a document (pictures themselves; column 6, lines 17-19); and

a second display portion for displaying a graphical indication that said document includes an audio annotation associated with said displayed portion of said document (annotations of pictures; column 6, lines 17-19), but does not specifically teach wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, wherein the audio annotations are in the form of audio clips, verbally delimiting keywords and dynamically accessing the audio clips based on search queries.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author (column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit's interface wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Schilit in view of Mishra discloses a user interface for displaying electronic information, but does not specifically teach wherein the audio annotations are in the form of audio clips, verbally delimiting keywords and dynamically accessing the audio clips based on search queries.

Oliver teaches said audio annotation (voice annotation) in the form of audio clips (voice clip) and said audio clips are stored in a storage which includes properties that permit audio information to be associated with a visual so that one audio clip is displayed with another (image file played back with voice clip; abstract with column 2, lines 21-44 and column 3, line 39 – column 4, line 67), to annotate documents with a description of the document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shilit in view of Mishra's interface wherein the audio annotations are in the form of audio clips, as taught by Oliver, to identify the

particular documents that are desired for the purpose of uploading to a host computer or displaying information (column 1, lines 43-54).

Schilit in view of Mishra and Oliver discloses an interface, but does not specifically teach verbally delimiting keywords and dynamically accessing the audio clips based on search queries.

Lucas teaches an interface comprising an audio input (voice controlled; column 3, lines 38-44) for receiving verbally delimited keywords (delimit) and converting said verbally delimited keywords into search queries (abstract with column 7, lines 25-30 and column 21, lines 35-67) and wherein the user interface is controlled by a processor which allows dynamically accessing the audio clips based on the search queries (abstract with column 7, lines 25-30 and column 21, lines 35-67), to manipulate documents.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and Oliver wherein it comprises delimiting keywords and dynamically accessing the audio clips based on search queries, as taught by Lucas, in order to specify portions of documents to be retrieved from a document repository (column 1, lines 36-44).

Regarding **claim 28**, Schilit discloses a user interface further comprising:
a third display portion for displaying a non-audio annotation (context of each annotation; column 6, lines 10-14).

Regarding **claim 31**, Schilit discloses a use interface further comprising:

a third display portion for receiving a user input of a property or properties of said audio annotation (attributes; column 5, line 61 – column 6, line 4).

Regarding **claim 32**, Schilit discloses a user interface wherein said audio annotation is recordable by said user (column 39-42 with column 6, lines 24-26).

Regarding **claim 33**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 27. In addition, Schilit discloses a process for recording an audio annotation comprising the steps of:

displaying electronic information (column 3, lines 52-56);

receiving a user input (column 6, lines 24-26 with column 3, lines 52-63 and column 5, line 45);

recording an audio annotation in response to said user input (column 4, lines 30-38); and

associating said audio annotation with properties including a displayed portion of said electronic information (associates attributes with annotations; column 4, lines 30-38), but does not specifically teach wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author (column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit's interface wherein said audio annotation

is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Regarding **claim 34**, Schilit discloses a process further comprising the step of: storing said audio annotation prior to the association of said audio annotation with said displayed portion (column 5, lines 42-64).

Regarding **claim 35**, Schilit discloses a process further comprising the step of: storing said audio annotation after the association of said audio annotation with said displayed portion (column 5, line 65 – column 6, line 4).

Regarding **claim 36**, Schilit discloses a process wherein said recording step records all ambient sounds (audio recording; column 4, lines 39-40 with column 6, lines 24-26).

Regarding **claim 39**, Schilit discloses a process further comprising the step of: associating additional properties with said audio annotation at the start of recording of said audio annotation (creation date; column 5, lines 61-64).

Regarding **claim 40**, Schilit discloses a process wherein one of said properties is a file position or document position of an item on said displayed portion of said electronic information (column 2, lines 63-66).

Regarding **claim 41**, Schilit discloses a process wherein one of said properties is a start identification of said displayed portion of said electronic information (creation date; column 5, lines 61-64).

Regarding **claim 42**, Schilit discloses a further comprising the steps of:

storing said audio annotation (stores the annotations; column 3, lines 62-63); and searching audio annotations including said audio annotation for at least one property matching a query (column 4, lines 30-38).

Regarding **claim 43**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 27. In addition, Schilit discloses a process for playing audio annotations comprising the steps of:

displaying a portion of electronic information (figure 2, element S160 with column 3, lines 60-63);

receiving a user input (column 4, lines 39-42 with column 6, lines 24-26);

assembling said audio annotations into an audio stream (column 4, lines 30-38 with column 6, lines 24-26); and playing said audio stream (column 4, lines 30-38 with column 6, lines 24-26), but does not specifically teach wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author (column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit's interface wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Regarding **claim 44**, Schilit discloses a process further comprising the step of: waiting for a second user input prior to playing said audio stream (column 4, lines 30-38).

Regarding **claim 45**, Schilit discloses a process further comprising the step of: playing said audio stream once said audio stream is assembled (column 4, lines 30-38).

Regarding **claim 46**, Schilit discloses a process wherein said user input is a text query (text; column 6, lines 24-26).

Regarding **claim 48**, Schilit discloses a process further comprising the steps of: altering the display of said portion to match a currently playing annotation in said audio stream (column 4, lines 30-38 with column 6, lines 24-26).

Regarding **claim 50**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 27. In addition, Schilit discloses a process for playing audio annotations comprising the steps of:

navigating to a page (reader to navigate; column 6, lines 5-9);
retrieving at least one audio annotation associated with a page or associated with an item on a page (column 4, lines 30-38 with column 6, lines 24-32); and
playing said at least one audio annotation (column 3, lines 57-63 with column 6, lines 24-32), but does not specifically teach wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author (column 12, line 59 – column

13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit's interface wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Regarding **claim 51**, Schilit discloses a process further comprising the step of: waiting for a user input prior to playing said audio annotation (column 4, lines 30-38 with column 6, lines 24-26).

Regarding **claim 52**, Schilit discloses a process wherein said item on said page includes at least one of embedded notes, inked notes, highlights or underlining (column 4, lines 44-48).

Regarding **claim 53**, Schilit discloses a process wherein said at least one audio annotation was previously retrieved and said retrieving step includes indexing said previously retrieved at least one audio annotation (column 5, lines 10-32).

Regarding **claim 54**, Schilit discloses a process wherein said at least one audio annotation is the result of a newly executed query (column 3, lines 52-63).

Regarding **claim 55**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 27. In addition, Schilit discloses a computer readable medium having a data structure stored thereon, said data structure comprising;

a document (column 3, lines 52-63);

a link object (column 4, lines 17-38); and
audio content with at least one property (column 5, lines 61-64),
wherein said link object references said document and references said audio content (column 4, lines 30-38),
wherein at least one property identifies an author of the at least one audio annotation (column 5, line 42 – column 6, line 32), but does not specifically teach wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author (column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit's interface wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Regarding **claim 56**, Schilit discloses a data structure wherein at least one property relates to the time said audio content started recording (column 5, lines 55-64).

Regarding **claim 58**, Schilit discloses a data structure wherein at least one property relates to the length of recording of said audio content (column 4, lines 49-56).

Regarding **claim 60**, Schilit discloses a data structure wherein at least one property relates to a start ID (column 4, lines 49-56 with column 5, lines 55-64).

Regarding **claim 62**, Schilit discloses a data structure wherein said audio content is comprised of a plurality of audio clips (column 4, lines 30-38 with column 6, lines 24-26).

Regarding **claim 63**, Schilit discloses a data structure wherein said audio clips are stored in a database (column 3, lines 57-63 with column 6, lines 24-26).

Regarding **claim 66**, Schilit discloses a data structure wherein said audio content is stored within a document (figure 1, element 16 with column 3, lines 52-63).

Regarding **claim 67**, Schilit discloses a data structure wherein said audio content is stored apart from a document (figure 1, element 18 with column 3, lines 52-63).

Regarding **claim 68**, Schilit discloses a data structure wherein said audio content is stored in a database with at least one property designating the position of viewed document relating to said audio content (column 4, lines 49-58).

Regarding **claim 69**, Schilit discloses a data structure wherein said audio content is stored in a database and linked to a separate annotation document that stores the position of a viewed document relating to said audio content (column 4, lines 30-38).

Regarding **claim 70**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 27. In addition, Schilit discloses a process for recording audio content comprising the steps of:

navigating to a page of a document (reader to navigate; column 6, lines 5-9);
recording said audio content (column 4, lines 39-40); and

associating properties with said audio content such that retrieval of said audio content positions said audio content after previously recorded audio content (column 4, lines 30-40),

wherein said audio content includes at least one audio annotation (column 5, line 42 – column 6, line 32), but does not specifically teach wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author (column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit's interface wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Regarding **claim 71**, Schilit discloses a process wherein said audio content comprises audio clips and properties include a time property (column 5, lines 56-64 with column 6, lines 24-26).

Regarding **claim 72**, Schilit discloses a process wherein said audio content and said previously recorded audio content is ordered at least by said time property (creation date; column 5, lines 61-64).

Regarding **claim 73**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 27. In addition, Schilit discloses a process of searching audio clips comprising the steps of:

inputting search terms or properties (column 5, lines 61-64);
searching said audio clips for said search terms or properties (column 4, lines 30-38); and
ordering audio clips detected by said searching step for output (column 4, lines 30-38 with column 5, lines 61-64 and column 6, lines 10-23), but does not specifically teach wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author (column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit's interface wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Regarding **claim 75**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 27. In addition, Schilit discloses a process for recording audio information comprising the steps of:

recording audio signals as a first file (column 4, lines 29-48);

processing said file to extract audio clips (column 6, lines 24-26); and
storing said audio clips (column 3, lines 52-63 with column 6, lines 24-26),
wherein said processing separates the content of said first file into audio clips based on
events (column 4, lines 30-38), but does not specifically teach wherein said audio
annotation is associated with an author.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user
wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author (column 12, line 59 – column
13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so
that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the
time the invention was made to modify Schilit's interface wherein said audio annotation
is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to
distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish
his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Regarding **claim 77**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set
forth in claim 27. In addition, Schilit discloses a process for associating audio notes and
handwritten notes comprising the steps of:

creating a handwritten note (inherent in pen-based device; column 3, lines 57-60
with column 6, lines 24-26);

associating a time at which said handwritten note was created with said
handwritten note (creation date; column 5, lines 55-65);

creating an audio note (column 6, lines 24-26); and

associating a time at which said audio note was created with said audio note (column 5, lines 55-65), wherein, upon selection of said handwritten note, audio notes recorded at or near the time at which said handwritten note was created are located (column 4, lines 17-56), but does not specifically teach wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author (column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit's interface wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Regarding **claim 81**, Schilit discloses a process wherein said audio notes are comprised of audio clips in which each audio clip has a time of creation associated with each audio clip (column 5, lines 55-64 with column 6, lines 24-26).

Regarding **claim 82**, Schilit discloses a process further comprising the step of: playing said audio notes (column 6, lines 24-26).

Regarding **claim 83**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 27. In addition, Schilit discloses a process for playing audio notes comprising the steps of:

displaying a first page of electronic information (presents using different list views; column 6, lines 5-9);

playing audio notes associated with said first page (column 4, lines 30-38);

displaying a second page of electronic information slide presentation (presents using different list views; column 6, lines 5-9); and

playing audio notes associated with said second page (column 4, lines 30-38), but does not specifically teach wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author (column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit's interface wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Regarding **claim 84**, Schilit discloses a process further comprising the step of receiving user input,

wherein, in response to said user input, said second page is displayed (reader to navigate; column 6, lines 5-9).

Regarding **claim 85**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 27. In addition, Schilit discloses a process of recording audio notes comprising the steps of:

- displaying a first page of electronic information (column 3, lines 52-63);
- recording a first set of audio notes (column 4, lines 69-40);
- associating said first set of audio notes with said first page (column 4, lines 30-38);
- displaying a second page of electronic information (column 3, lines 52-63);
- recording a second set of audio notes (column 4, lines 39-40); and
- associating said second set of audio notes with said second page (column 4, lines 30-38), but does not specifically teach wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author (column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit's interface wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Regarding **claim 86**, Schilit discloses a process further comprising the step of receiving user input (column 3, lines 52-63),

wherein, in response to said user input, said second page is displayed (column 6, lines 5-23).

7. **Claims 1, 4-6, 9-10 and 13-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Milne et al. (USPN 5,390,138), hereinafter referenced as Milne in view of Mishra in further view of Oliver and Lucas.

Regarding **claim 1**, Milne discloses a system for receiving audio input comprising:

a display for displaying electronic information (column 10, line 67 – column 11, line 3);

an audio input receiving audio content (column 10, lines 27-28); and

a processor (figure 1, element 10) for associating said received audio content with said displayed electronic information (column 8, lines 36-39 with column 10, line 67 – column 11, line 3), but lacks wherein said processor further associates an author with each of said audio annotations, each of said audio annotations being randomly accessible based on the author, wherein the audio annotations are in the form of audio clips, verbally delimiting keywords and dynamically accessing the audio clips based on search queries.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said processor further associates an author with each of said audio annotations, each of said audio annotations being randomly accessible based on the author (column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Milne's interface wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Milne in view of Mishra discloses a user interface for displaying electronic information, but does not specifically teach wherein the audio annotations are in the form of audio clips, verbally delimiting keywords and dynamically accessing the audio clips based on search queries.

Oliver teaches said audio annotation (voice annotation) in the form of audio clips (voice clip) and said audio clips are stored in a storage which includes properties that permit audio information to be associated with a visual so that one audio clip is displayed with another (image file played back with voice clip; abstract with column 2, lines 21-44 and column 3, line 39 – column 4, line 67), to annotate documents with a description of the document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Milne in view of Mishra's interface wherein the

audio annotations are in the form of audio clips, as taught by Oliver, to identify the particular documents that are desired for the purpose of uploading to a host computer or displaying information (column 1, lines 43-54).

Milne in view of Mishra and Oliver discloses an interface, but does not specifically teach verbally delimiting keywords and dynamically accessing the audio clips based on search queries.

Lucas teaches an interface comprising an audio input (voice controlled; column 3, lines 38-44) for receiving verbally delimited keywords (delimit) and converting said verbally delimited keywords into search queries (abstract with column 7, lines 25-30 and column 21, lines 35-67) and wherein the user interface is controlled by a processor which allows dynamically accessing the audio clips based on the search queries (abstract with column 7, lines 25-30 and column 21, lines 35-67), to manipulate documents.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Milne in view of Mishra and Oliver wherein it comprises delimiting keywords and dynamically accessing the audio clips based on search queries, as taught by Lucas, in order to specify portions of documents to be retrieved from a document repository (column 1, lines 36-44).

Regarding **claim 4**, Milne discloses a system further comprising:

a storage for storing said audio content with said at least one property (audio can be stored; column 9, lines 63-65 with column 19, lines 66-67).

Regarding **claim 5**, Milne discloses a system further comprising:

an input receiving a user's input (column 10, lines 27-28),

wherein said processor starts recording audio content from said audio input in response to said user's input (video tape recorders; column 8, lines 53-60 with column 10, lines 25-32).

Regarding **claim 6**, Milne discloses a system wherein said processor includes a voice activated recording system for recording said audio content (column 10, lines 25-32 with a record member function; column 19, lines 53-54).

Regarding **claim 9**, Milne disclose a system wherein said processor controls said display to indicate that audio content is associated with said displayed electronic information.

Regarding **claim 10**, it is interpreted and rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1. In addition, Milne discloses a system for playing audio content, said system comprising:

a display for displaying electronic information (column 10, line 67 – column 11, line 3);

a storage for storing audio content (audio can be stored; column 9, lines 63-65 with column 19, lines 66-67), said audio content including properties and being associated with said displayed electronic information (column 8, lines 36-39 with column 10, line 67 – column 11, line 3);

an output for outputting at least some of said audio content responsive to navigation of said displayed electronic information (column 10, line 66 – column 11, line 3); and

a processor for controlling said display, said storage and said output (figure 1, element 10), but lacks wherein said processor further associates an author with each of said audio annotations, each of said audio annotations being randomly accessible based on the author.

Mishra teaches a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user wherein said processor further associates an author with each of said audio annotations, each of said audio annotations being randomly accessible based on the author (column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 45 with column 19, lines 8-17 and column 28, line 61 – column 29, line 22), so that the marks are distinguishable.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Milne's interface wherein said audio annotation is associated with an author, as taught by Mishra, to make it helpful to others to distinguish marks made by user A from those of user B and even a user to distinguish his or her down earlier remarks from current ones (column 19, lines 7-17).

Regarding **claim 13**, Milne discloses a system, wherein said storage is a database (audio can be stored; column 9, lines 63-65 with column 19, lines 66-67).

Regarding **claim 14**, Milne discloses a system further comprising:
an input for receiving a user's input (column 10, lines 27-28),

wherein said output outputs at least some of said audio content in response to receiving said user's input (column 10, line 66 – column 11, line 3).

Regarding **claim 15**, Milne discloses a system further comprising:

an input for receiving a user's input (column 10, lines 27-28),

wherein said processor searches properties of said stored audio content in response to said user's input (video tape recorders; column 8, lines 53-60 with column 10, lines 25-32).

Regarding **claim 16**, Milne discloses a system wherein the output of said processor is sent to said display to display an indication of the search results (column 14, lines 65-68).

Regarding **claim 17**, Milne discloses a system wherein the output of said controller is sent to the output for playing audio content with properties matching the search results (audio data; column 8, lines 47-50 with column 14, lines 65-68 with column 21, lines 35-38).

Regarding **claim 18**, Milne discloses a system wherein said processor retrieves all audio content associated with said electronic information when said electronic information is accessed (media components connected together; column 8, lines 36-60 with column 11, lines 35-36).

Regarding **claim 19**, Milne discloses a system wherein said processor outputs selected audio content to be played through said output when a page of said electronic information is displayed (column 10, line 67 – column 11, line 3).

Regarding **claim 20**, Milne discloses a system wherein said processor automatically plays said selected audio content when said page is displayed (audio component represented graphically on the display; column 10, lines 38-44 with column 10, line 67 – column 11, line 3).

Regarding **claim 21**, Milne discloses a system further comprising:

a communication link to transmit said audio content (connection linking audio component; column 10, lines 55-56 with column 11, lines 35-36).

Regarding **claim 22**, Milne discloses a system further comprising: a network connected to said communication link for receiving said audio content, said network being accessible by other users (multiple clients to share; column 9, lines 1-4).

Regarding **claim 23**, Milne discloses a system further comprising:

a receiving device of another user for receiving said audio content, said receiving device receiving said audio content through one of a wired (connecting devices with connecting workstation to network; column 4, lines 24-44) or wireless interface.

Regarding **claim 24**, Milne discloses a system wherein said network further processes said audio content (processing audio components; column 8, lines 36-50).

Regarding **claim 25**, Milne discloses a system wherein said network includes a database for storing said audio content (audio can be stored; column 9, lines 63-65 with column 19, lines 66-67).

Regarding **claim 26**, Milne discloses a system wherein said network receives audio content without receiving said electronic information associated with said audio content (audio and video; column 8, lines 36-60).

8. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milne in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas, as applied to claim 6, in view of Hou et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,313), hereinafter referenced as Hou.

Regarding **claim 7**, Milne in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas discloses a system wherein said voice activated recording system, but lacks wherein the system records when said audio content exceeds a predetermined threshold.

Hou discloses a system wherein the system records when said audio content exceeds (is not less than) a predetermined threshold (column 7, lines 63-65), to determine distance between previous and new events.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Milne in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's invention such that it records when said audio content exceeds a predetermined threshold as in Hou, to have a report which consists of the individual's visual and audio annotations, which can be synchronized for playing back (column 2, lines 30-36).

9. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milne in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas as applied to claim 6, in view of Dwyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,571,211), hereinafter referenced as Dwyer.

Regarding **claim 8**, Milne in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas discloses a system for receiving audio input, but lacks wherein said voice activated recording system records when a known user's voice is detected in said audio content.

Dwyer discloses the system wherein said voice activated recording system records when a known user's voice is detected in said audio content (column 7, lines 46-67), so that the users may more readily locate their own voice data files.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Milne in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's invention such that the recording step records only a specific user's voice, to identify an author of a voice data file, which aids in indexing the voice data files, so that the users may more readily locate their own voice data files (column 7, lines 46-67).

10. **Claim 29** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas and in further view of Headley et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0194260), hereinafter referenced as Headley.

Regarding **claim 29**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a user interface for displaying electronic information to a user, but lacks a third display portion for displaying an indication that said audio annotation is being recorded or played back.

Headley discloses a user interface further comprising:

a third display portion for displaying an indication that said audio annotation is being recorded or played back (figure 6, element 606), to display additional information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's interface wherein it discloses a third display portion for displaying an indication that said audio annotation is being recorded or played back, as taught by Headley, to display additional information related to each entry in the multimedia playlist (column 5, paragraph 0049).

11. **Claim 30** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas and in further view of Aihara et al. (USPN 5,644,674), hereinafter referenced as Aihara.

Regarding **claim 30**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a user interface for displaying electronic information, but lacks a third display portion for displaying one of a document tape or a master tape.

Aihara discloses a display portion (figure 4, element 33) for displaying one of a document tape or a master tape (figure 4, elements 34a-34d with column 16, lines 24-33), to view the modified playback picture.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of

Oliver and Lucas's interface, as taught by Aihara, to allow the user to view the modified playback picture to confirm whether or not the picture has been modified in the desired manner (column 16, lines 24-33).

12. **Claim 36** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas and in further view of Fielder (USPN 6,205,419).

Regarding **claim 36**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas discloses a system wherein a voice activated recording system, but does not specifically teach recording all ambient sounds.

Fielder teaches a continuous recording process that records ambient sounds (column 6, lines 41-46), to improve audio quality.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's process, wherein it records ambient sounds, as taught by Fielder, to detect and cancel ambient noise, which provides signal enhancement (column 6, lines 41-46).

13. **Claim 37** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas and in further view of Hou et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,313), hereinafter referenced as Hou.

Regarding **claim 37**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a system wherein a voice activated recording system, but lacks wherein the system records when said audio content exceeds a predetermined threshold.

Hou discloses a process wherein said recording step records only sounds above a predetermined threshold (is not less than the threshold; column 7, lines 63-65), to determine distance between previous and new events.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's invention such that it records only sounds above a predetermined threshold, as in Hou, to have a report which consists of the individual's visual and audio annotations, which can be synchronizes for playing back (column 2, lines 30-36).

14. **Claim 38** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas and Hou, as applied to claim 37, further in view of Dwyer.

Regarding **claim 38**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver, Lucas and Hou disclose a system for receiving audio input, but lacks wherein said recording step records only a specific user's voice.

Dwyer discloses the system wherein said recording step records only a specific user's voice (column 7, lines 46-67), so that the users may more readily locate their own voice data files.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in combination with Mishra and in further view of Oliver, Lucas and Hou's invention such that voice activated recording system records when a known user's voice is detected in said audio content, to identify an author of a voice data file, which aids in indexing the voice data files, so that the users may more readily locate their own voice data files (column 7, lines 46-67).

15. **Claims 47 and 76** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas and Milne.

Regarding **claim 47**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a process for playing audio annotations, but lacks wherein said user input is a voice query.

Milne discloses an object-oriented audio system wherein said user input is a voice query (column 10, lines 25-32), to create a variety of interesting applications.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's process wherein said user input is voice query, as taught by Milne, to present a multimedia presentation with a variety of interesting applications (column 10, lines 21-32).

Regarding **claim 76**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a process wherein said events comprise at least one of short pauses in

said speech, a pause of a predetermined length, and a user navigating away from a displayed page (column 6, lines 5-9), but lacks wherein said audio signals include speech.

Milne discloses an object-oriented audio system wherein audio signals include speech (column 10, lines 25-32), to create a variety of interesting applications.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's process wherein said audio signals include speech, to present a multimedia presentation with a variety of interesting applications (column 10, lines 21-32).

16. **Claim 49** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas and in further view of Pritt (U.S. Patent No. 5,689,717).

Regarding **claim 49**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a process for recording an audio annotation, but lacks including the steps of comparing the length and displaying a portion of electronic information.

Pritt discloses the process including the steps of:

comparing the length (determining the position) of said currently playing annotation with starting identifications of displayable portions of said electronic information (column 4, lines 15-30); and

displaying the portion of said electronic information (display annotations) supporting the greater length of said currently playing annotation (currently displayed; column 4, lines 15-30), for the placement of annotations on a computer display of various sizes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's invention such that it includes the steps of comparing the length and displaying a portion of electronic information as in Pritt, for placement of annotations of various sizes without overlapping currently displayed annotations (column 1, lines 10-15).

17. **Claims 57 and 61** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas and in further view Jain et al. (USPN 6,144,375), hereinafter referenced as Jain.

Regarding **claim 57**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a computer readable medium having a data structure, but lacks wherein at least one property relating to the time said audio content stopped recording.

Jain discloses a data structure wherein at least one property relates to the time said audio content stopped recording (column 19, line 54 – column 20, line 11), to create a multi-media database.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's medium, as taught by Jain, such that at least one property relates to the time said audio content stopped recording, to thereby create a database that synchronizes and associates multiple multi-media data types with multi-media events of interest to an end user or client (column 20, lines 4-11).

Regarding **claim 61**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a computer readable medium having a data structure, but lacks a data structure wherein at least one property relates to a stop ID.

Jain discloses a data structure wherein at least one property relates to a stop ID (column 19, line 54 – column 20, line 11), to create a multi-media database.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's medium wherein at least one property relates to a stop ID, as taught by Jain, to thereby create a database that synchronizes and associates multiple multi-media data types with multi-media events of interest to an end user or client (column 20, lines 4-11).

18. **Claim 59** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas and in further view Hurtado et al. (USPN 6,418,421), hereinafter referenced as Hurtado.

Regarding **claim 59**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a computer readable medium having a data structure, but lacks wherein said property relates to the author of the recording.

Hurtado discloses a data structure wherein said property relates to the author of the recording (column 42, lines 40-43), to obtain a unique value that is assigned to the entity of creation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's medium, as taught by Hurtado, wherein said property relates to the author of the recording to validate the authenticity and integrity of the contents (column 42, lines 5-43).

19. **Claims 64 and 65** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas and in further view of Martin et al. (USPN 6,272,484), hereinafter referenced as Martin.

Regarding **claim 64**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a data structure of audio content, but lacks wherein said property is one of a plurality of properties and wherein at least one properties are in a marked up language form.

Martin discloses an electronic document wherein said property is one of plurality of properties and wherein at least on of a plurality properties are in a marked up

language form (column 6, lines 19-36), to use various applications on a computer system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's structure wherein said property is one of plurality of properties and at least one of a plurality properties are in a marked up language form, as taught by Martin, to have a variety of formats to view (column 6, lines 19-36).

Regarding **claim 65**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a data structure of audio content, but lacks wherein said properties are in XML.

Martin discloses an electronic document wherein said properties are in XML, (column 6, lines 19-36), to use various applications on a computer system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's structure wherein said properties are in XML, as taught by Martin, to have a variety of formats to view (column 6, lines 19-36).

20. **Claim 79-80** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas and in further view of Miller et al. (USPN 5,801,685), hereinafter referenced as Miller

Regarding **claim 79**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a process for associating audio notes and handwritten notes, but lacks locating said audio notes includes the step of searching a table.

Miller discloses a process wherein locating said audio notes includes the step of searching a table (column 15, lines 29-43 and column 16, lines 11-14), to indicate the location of the clip.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's process, such as taught by Miller, wherein locating said audio notes includes the step of searching a table, to indicate the location of the clip (column 15, lines 29-43), for easy access, which is well know in the art.

Regarding **claim 80**, Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas disclose a process for associating audio notes and handwritten notes, but lacks locating said audio notes includes the step of searching a linked list.

Millier discloses a process wherein locating said audio notes includes the step of searching a linked list (column 9, lines 34-55 with column 11, lines 14-42), to obtain the raw information that resides in the server.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schilit in view of Mishra and in further view of Oliver and Lucas's process, such as taught by Miller, wherein locating said audio notes includes the step of searching a linked list, to allow information to be obtained (column 11, lines 14-42), with easy access, which is well known in the art.

Conclusion

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAKIEDA R. JACKSON whose telephone number is (571)272-7619. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 5:30am-2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JRJ

July 12, 2008

/David R Hudspeth/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626